

City of Springfield  
Work Session Meeting

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION MEETING OF  
THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL HELD  
MONDAY, APRIL 25, 2005.

The City of Springfield council met in a work session in the Jesse Maine Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday, April 25, 2005 at 5:30 p.m., with Mayor Leiken presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Mayor Leiken and Councilors Fitch, Ballew, Lundberg, and Woodrow. Also present were City Manager Mike Kelly, Assistant City Manager Cynthia Pappas, City Attorney Joe Leahy, City Recorder Amy Sowa and members of the staff.

Councilors Ralston and Pishioneri were absent (excused).

1. Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funding.

Transportation Manager Nick Arnis presented the staff report on this item. MPC reviews and approves metro jurisdiction applications for federal STP funds which are then adopted in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). There is approximately \$1,282,000 in STP funds that MPC may allocate for 2006.

In September 2003, MPC approved the allocation of \$6.75 million in STP funds for projects submitted by the cities of Springfield, Eugene, and Coburg, and Lane County and Lane Transit District. The funds and projects covered three years from 2004 through 2006. MPC selected four project categories and assigned a targeted percentage to the \$6.75 million:

|                                  |            |             |
|----------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| System Preservation              | 50 percent | \$3,375,000 |
| System Modernization             | 20 percent | \$1,350,000 |
| Planning and Project Development | 20 percent | \$1,350,000 |
| Transportation Demand Management | 10 percent | \$ 675,000  |

Also in 2003, MPC approved the following City STP submitted projects from the above categories:

|  |                         |
|--|-------------------------|
| 21 <sup>st</sup> Street reconstruction (System Preservation) | \$640,000 for 06        |
| Pioneer Parkway overlay (System Preservation)                | \$400,000 for 06        |
| 69 <sup>th</sup> Street improvements (System Modernization)  | \$431,000 for 06        |
| Planning funds (Planning and Project Development)            | \$175,000 for 04 and 05 |

The STP revenue projections for this metro area from the state and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are higher for 2005 and 2006 than anticipated when MPC allocated the STP funds in 2003. There is approximately \$1,282,000 million available for the metro area that remains to be allocated by MPC. At the next MPC meeting, May 12<sup>th</sup>, MPC may decide to allocate the \$1,282,000. City staff recommends a higher percentage of funding first for planning and development and second for preservation with the \$1,282,000 and apply for \$400,000 in planning and development funds for Franklin Boulevard and Gateway/Beltline planning and project development, and seek funding for two preservation projects, EWEB bike path

reconstruction (EWEB path is under the jurisdiction of Lane County), and 5<sup>th</sup> Street overlay (Main to Hayden Bridge).

Mr. Arnis introduced Tom Schwetz, Project Manager from the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) who was in the audience and available to answer questions. Mr. Arnis said the action requested during the meeting was for the City Council to provide direction to the council members who represented Springfield on the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC): Mayor Leiken and Councilor Ballew. He said there was about \$1.2M that had not been allocated by the MPC for transportation projects in the metro area. The members of the MPC included Springfield, Eugene, Coburg, Lane County and Lane Transit District. He distributed a list of 2003 projects that MPC had approved as requested by Councilor Lundberg. He referred to a map on the wall from 2003 of the projects Springfield applied for. Some were funded and some were not.

Mr. Arnis distributed information requested by Councilor Lundberg regarding the 2003 Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) Surface Transportation Program (STP) project ranking lists. He referred to a map showing the area and described the formation of the MPC. The regional transportation plan was established at that time to include additional elements. Calculations were made with ODOT regarding how much money would come to the area. That amount was purposefully underestimated to insure the money would be there for the projects needed. Because of that, there was now \$1.3M that had not yet been allocated by the MPC. He discussed the pros and cons of the three options as outlined in the agenda item summary.

- Option 1: Allocate the funds for the 2006 across the 2003 approved project categories and existing percentages that include a 2003 MPC approved project list for each category. Based on the 2003 MPC action about the categories and percentages distributed among the categories, the \$1,282,000 is approximately divided as such: Preservation \$641,000; Modernization \$256,400; Planning and Development \$256,000; and Demand Management \$128,200.
- Option 2: Modify the funding percentages for the project categories. First, increase the STP funding percentages for the planning and development, and project categories. Second, increase the funding percentage for the preservation category. Apply for \$400,000 in planning and development funds for Franklin Boulevard planning and Gateway/Beltline project development, and if needed, resubmit the EWEB bike path reconstruction, with Lane County support and assistance, and 5<sup>th</sup> Street overlay (Main to Hayden Bridge) for preservation funding.
- Option 3: Delay a decision and carryover the \$1,282,000 to the 2007-09 STP funding process to begin summer 2005.

Mr. Arnis said staff supported Option 2 because the city currently had money allocated in the System Development Charge money to plan Franklin Boulevard. If the city used this STP money, it would free up the city money for modernization projects. He said it was federal money, which had a lot of requirements attached involving ODOT requirements. The best use of the funding would be for the planning and development rather than modernization. The city would not have a project ready for the funds right now. He said the next MPC meeting would include getting staff recommendation from the metro staff and Transportation and Planning Committee, which Springfield was part of, to provide direction to MPC. He wanted to bring this to council early enough to get their input and advice.

Mayor Leiken said staff had done a wonderful job managing the street fund for the city under Public Works Director Dan Brown's leadership. He said other communities had not done so well.

Councilor Ballew asked if Mr. Arnis could explain how the rating systems worked. She said over the years, Springfield had done a great job of preserving, resurfacing and modernizing our roads as needed. The City of Eugene's dedication to preservation had not been as rigid as Springfield's over the years so there was a lot of effort on their part to put all funding into preservation. She said it was important to be as flexible as possible to be ready for opportunities.

Mr. Arnis said there were four categories for projects in the modernization/preservation planning project development. Each category had criteria developed based on the TransPlan. He discussed some of those criteria. He said preservation was more difficult to create criteria, so he explained how the point system had been created.

Mr. Schwetz said it was a change from how funds were allocated at the direction of the Federal Highway Administration (FHA). A merit based approach was developed to allocate the funds and the criteria and process was developed by the regional technical staff and TPC. The next step in allocating the funds was scheduled to begin in September, but that was contingent on congressional reauthorization.

Mr. Arnis said the project categories were ranked and jurisdictions submitted applications, which were ranked by staff and approved by MPC.

Councilor Ballew said the percentages were what MPC chose, but she asked if they needed to be in the same four categories.

Mr. Schwetz said those were developed at the staff level and could be changed.

Mayor Leiken noted that Councilor Ballew was currently the Chair of the MPC. He said flexibility would be important for Springfield, although Eugene wanted to be more rigid on preservation. He discussed the gas tax and funding from the county. The big issue regarding preservation was to show responsibility to the citizens. When Springfield received funding, there would be a number of possibilities that could require more money rather than preservation. He asked if discussion had been held with the county.

Mr. Arnis said during the last metro staff meeting Lane County, Coburg and LTD were asked what direction they would like to go with this funding. He said the Eugene staff said they wanted one hundred percent going to preservation. He said the list would have to be reordered if they went to one hundred percent preservation.

Mayor Leiken asked if this money was allocated regionally, rather than per jurisdiction.

Mr. Arnis said that was correct.

Mr. Schwetz said the region would have to decide how to allocate the funds. Eugene's council as a whole wanted to find out if they could increase the amount going to preservation. He said they had not stated that they wanted one hundred percent for preservation, but that they wanted to increase the amount going to preservation.

Mayor Leiken asked if council would receive a breakdown of those possibilities.

Councilor Lundberg confirmed that this was everyone's money. She liked that these were federal dollars, and said the less encumbered the better. She discussed the Eugene Water and Electric Board (EWEB) bike path reconstruction as listed in Option 2. She said there were a few safety points on 5<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Streets that could be addressed; however, most of it was nice straight streets. She said it was not important if that was to get bumped up because it was still in good shape. She discussed 5<sup>th</sup> Street and the many issues with that road that should be addressed.

Mr. Arnis said she was correct. The intersections on that path are the problem areas. He said it was a county facility and the county should take care of those improvements. A lot more work was needed on that road.

Councilor Fitch said Option 2 was her choice with the flexibility.

Councilor Ballew asked if it was a permanent modification on the funding percentages or just for this amount of money.

Mr. Arnis said it was just for the \$1.3M.

Mr. Schwetz said it was unclear how much would be allocated during the next reauthorization.

Mayor Leiken said council could ask for a date certain.

Mr. Arnis said staff would recommend meeting with other jurisdictions to see how best to spend the money now.

Councilor Ballew said Eugene had increased their gas tax by two percent. She said they could use that for preservation.

Mr. Arnis said there was an MPC meeting next month, as well as other staff directions. He said he would relay council's ideas and direction to the staff meetings.

## 2. Sewer and Drainage User Rates Options.

City Engineer Al Peroutka and Environmental Services Supervisor Gary Colwell presented the staff report on this item. The council has discussed the issue of unmet capital funding needs during three recent work sessions as follows:

- March 7, 2005 - The state of our current funding for sanitary and stormwater management projects, and the choices which face the city regarding the ability to fund unmet needs through adjustments in priorities or adjustments to SDCs or user rates;
- March 14, 2005, - Policy issues related to SDCs and the relationship of SDCs to capital funding needs; and

- March 28, 2005 - User rates, including options for the council to consider in deciding on new rates for next year, and the appropriate balance of user rate and SDC funding needed to support sanitary and stormwater capital project needs. User rate options were presented for council discussion and feedback.

At the council's April 25th work session, staff will present several refined user rate options and discuss their impact on the FY 05-06 budget as well as the unmet sanitary and drainage capital funding needs of the city. The council may recommend or further refine an option to take to public hearing and adoption in May.

Mr. Peroutka said staff was preparing for the May 2, 2005 public hearing on this item. He said Mr. Colwell had been working on his modeling work and had good news for council regarding storm drainage rates. He referred to Councilor Lundberg's question regarding priorities for the unmet capital needs that had been discussed at previous work sessions. He referred to page 2 of Attachment A in the agenda packet which showed the unmet sanitary capital funding needs in priority order. He also referred to page 3 of Attachment A which showed the unmet stormwater capital funding needs in priority order.

Mr. Colwell said he developed two additional options beyond holding the rates. He discussed the three options as listed on page 3 of Attachment A in the agenda packet. He discussed how he re-calculated the figures which showed there would be less of an increase in rates. He said the rates were sufficient where they were for operating costs and proposed capital costs for local sanitary and drainage user fees for the FY05-06 budget. He referred to the unmet needs charts and how each option would relate to those needs. Option 1 would not fund the unmet needs, Option 2 would meet fifty percent of the unmet needs, and Option 3 would meet one hundred percent of the unmet needs.

Councilor Ballew discussed SDC's. She said Eugene collected more in SDC's than Springfield, so their user rates were less. She asked if that was part of Option 2. She asked about a policy that Springfield subsidized fifty percent. She referred to the Jasper Road Trunk Sewer project listed on the unmet needs chart on page 2 of Attachment A in the agenda packet and asked if the other fifty percent would come through SDC's.

Mr. Peroutka said the other fifty percent would be paid by developers outside the SDC process, in things such as grants or cash upfront. He cited the example of the sanitary sewer extension for the PeaceHealth development.

Councilor Ballew asked where the SDC's came into this.

Mr. Peroutka said in the past, the city had given credits against the upfront funding from developers.

Councilor Ballew said it would appear Eugene charged the SDC and the upfront costs. She said Springfield may not be able to continue to give credits.

Mr. Colwell said by the SDC state statute, credits were required.

Councilor Ballew asked if we were collecting enough for growth in SDC rates. She wasn't sure if that was reflected in this proposal.

Mr. Colwell said it was not reflected. His calculations were made without consideration of the implications of SDC's. Option 2 would give leeway to look at where to put the SDC's.

Mr. Goodwin said part of the process in looking at the SDC's would be to determine whether or not the city was capturing in SDC's as much as possible. If the city could collect more, staff would bring that proposal forward to council.

Councilor Woodrow asked about Option 2. He asked if the city would need to come back for increases the second year to pick up the other fifty percent. He asked if the city's costs would continue to be increased.

Mr. Colwell said if the annual allocation capital increased by \$290,000 on the sanitary side and \$110,000 on the drainage side, the unmet needs would increase twice as much each year for five years. Option 2 would spread that out over six years and allow some flexibility to see what SDC fees were doing.

Councilor Woodrow said every year user rates were being increased. He said it would be nice if user rates did not have to be raised each year. He asked if the proposed Gray/Jaqua development should be a higher priority than the build-up of reserves.

Mr. Kelly said the Gray/Jaqua project was in final review of contract and annexation agreement. He said the agreements should be back to council for final approval in the next thirty to forty-five days. Staff had worked on this proposal for over a year.

Mr. Brown addressed the concern about SDC's not being as high as they ought to be for handling the development share of capital improvement costs. He said when the city last updated the SDC's, the storm drainage SDC's were left alone because the stormwater master plan was outdated. He said once that plan was updated, the stormwater SDC's would be updated because they were out of date and undoubtedly quite low at this time. He said project estimates were also quite low because of the increase in construction costs that had occurred over the last two to three years. Both of those would be updated within the next year.

Mr. Kelly said the traditional use of bond issues, sewer user fees, or SDC's in smaller projects was easy to understand in each of those categories. As the SDC ordinance came into favor twenty years ago, it changed how things were done. The city had not put a lot of large projects in the project list. More and more ODOT had required more local shares in these large projects. He discussed the SDC rates and how to balance rates against encouraging development. Springfield was now facing, as a community issue, large projects such as PeaceHealth and Jasper Road Extension that had been bond issues in the past. He discussed whether or not these projects should be part of the SDC methodology because they were growth related, or by revenue bonds. He discussed capacity components that were paid in the past by borrowing money from the state and paying it back through user fees. He discussed staff's concerns about this change when looking at these larger projects.

Councilor Lundberg thanked staff for putting things in order. She discussed SDC credits and how that affected city income. She agreed with Option 2 with the idea of looking at SDC's. She acknowledged that changes to SDC methodology would be a very difficult process which would be scrutinized by many. She said she wanted to make sure that updating the SDC methodology

would be fair and equitable, would still encourage growth in the community, but would not put the burden on users. Option 2 left that flexibility.

Councilor Fitch said she also agreed with Option 2 because it set it up, addressed the user part and set up criteria to review the SDC's. She said it would not be easy, but was necessary. She said there needed to be a balance and it needed to be done before too long.

Mayor Leiken discussed the partnership the city used to have with the state and federal government to assist in these issues. The old sanitary sewer facility was built with federal funds, but we no longer had that option. He noted the many unfunded mandates from the federal government. He said he supported Option 2.

Councilor Ballew agreed. She said there may not be an option that would not include raising rates because costs do increase.

Council consensus was to move forward with Option 2.

3. An Ordinance Concerning Sanitary Sewer Charges Including Rates and Amending Section 4.206 of the Springfield Municipal Code.

Environmental Services Manager Gary Colwell presented the staff report on this item. Section 4.206 of the Springfield Municipal Code specifies how volume based sanitary sewer rates shall be determined. During the months of December through April, sewer rates shall be based on actual metered water consumption. During the months of May through November, sewer rates shall be based on the average of the December through April metered water consumption. For years, the actual practice during the months of May through November has been to base sewer rates on the average of the December through April metered water consumption or the actual metered water consumption, which ever is least. Staff proposes amending Section 4.206 of the Springfield Municipal Code to bring the Code into line with practice.

The use of the average of December through April metered water consumption to compute sanitary sewer fees is based on the premise that water usage during the winter months goes down the sewer while many people begin irrigating gardens and lawns in May. The intent was to not charge sewer fees for water being used for other uses such as irrigation. There was never any intent to charge for more than was discharged to the sewer.

Mr. Colwell said this was brought to his attention by Technical Services Manager Len Goodwin. He would like to bring this to council for approval at a future council meeting.

Councilor Ballew asked if this had been in practice.

Mr. Colwell said it had.

Councilor Fitch asked what would happen if someone wanted to contest it and note that they should have been charged more.

Mr. Leahy said it was unlikely it would be contested.

4. Projected City Manager Recruitment 2005.

Human Resources Director Bill Spiry presented the staff report on this item. This briefing is presented to council to summarize points for consideration, and to provide a suggested guide to the recruitment process for replacement of the City Manager in 2005.

This recruitment represents a search to replace Mike Kelly, who is retiring from his 16-year tenure as City Manager this Fall. This recruitment for Springfield City Manager is perhaps the most important decision this council will make for the future of this community. Under the direction of the City Council, the City Manager, "...plans, organizes, and directs the overall administrative activities and operations of the city, to ensure the most effective use of financial and human resources in the provision of city services to the public."

There are a number of important decisions that must occur to ensure a successful recruitment process which are described in detail in the attached Council Briefing Memorandum and corresponding documents.

Estimated Cost of Executive Search services: \$15,000 to \$20,000

Estimated M & S Expenses: \$4,000 to \$7,000

Mr. Spiry said this was the first formal conversation with council regarding Mike Kelly's replacement and the process to fill his position. Mr. Spiry said his role was to assist the council with this process. Typically, recruitment of this size took six or seven months to complete. He described the processes available to the council including making an immediate appointment of the candidate or performing a full recruitment regionally or nationally. Council must make a decision during a public meeting on how the recruitment process would occur.

Mr. Spiry said this was a very high profile position and would involve input from groups outside and inside the organization. He referred to a timeline that was included in the agenda packet. He referred to the difficulties in trying to maintain a tight schedule, especially over the summer months. He noted that the timeline could be influenced depending on whether an internal recruitment was done using city staff or an executive search firm performed the recruitment. The process could begin very soon. Human Resources staff had established the groundwork. He would recommend utilizing an executive search firm to assist the city with this recruitment. The executive search firm could offer services beyond what city staff could offer. Springfield had not recruited for this level of position very often, so staff was not familiar with the process. Hiring a search firm may actually speed up the process. He discussed the demands on city staff if the recruitment was done in house.

Mr. Spiry also recommended a subcommittee be appointed to assist staff and help coordinate the steps. The subcommittee could assist in choosing an executive search firm. In checking with the city's Purchasing Manager, Jon Hiltbrand, it was determined a Request for Proposal (RFP) was not required for this type of service. It was recommended that it go through a Request for Qualification (RFQ). The RFQ process was less formal and would allow the city to use a process that would not require coming to the full council for final contract decision. A similar process was used to recruit for the Assistant City Manager several years ago.

Mayor Leiken asked if he could relay the comments he had received from Councilors Ralston and Pishioneri, who were not in attendance, although he would not be proxy for them.



City Attorney Joe Leahy agreed he would not be acting in proxy, but Mayor Leiken could relay their comments. No final decision would be made during the work session.

Councilor Lundberg referred to the phases listed on page 3 of Attachment 1 in the agenda packet. The timing on the phases was only about three months, but Mr. Spiry referred to a longer period of time. She asked where in the process the additional time would be needed.

Mr. Spiry said much of the additional time would be in coordination of interviews, meetings and other scheduled times. Because this would occur during the summer, there would be other scheduling issues, such as vacations and council recess. If everyone was available and scheduling could move along, the interviews could be scheduled by mid to late August, with a selection made by early September.

Councilor Lundberg asked about timing built in to the phasing in case a qualified candidate was not found or the candidate that was chosen turned down the position at the last moment.

Mr. Spiry said one of the advantages of using an executive search firm was the pool of potential candidates they would contact for this type of opportunity. The firm would build those scenarios into their schedule. He discussed offering the job to the second choice if the first choice were to back out.

Councilor Lundberg asked if there was a difference in cost between a regional or national search.

Mr. Spiry said there would not be more of a cost, but there would be more original applicants with a national search.

Councilor Ballew asked if Mr. Kelly would be willing to extend his term if someone was not chosen by September 1, 2005.

Mr. Kelly said that was correct. His target date was the first of September, and he would be gone most of September, but he cared enough about this transition to make it smooth.

Councilor Woodrow said he did not believe an executive search firm was needed. There was staff available that could fill the position if council chose to appoint. He noted, however, that the rest of the council was inclined to conduct a search. He asked Mr. Spiry about Phase 4 and if it was standard to wait until that phase to do background checks. He asked if it would be more efficient to do the background checks first.

Mr. Spiry said both checks could be done very close to each other. He discussed background checks and reference checks. Background checks were normally done on the last one to three candidates and often only on the candidate offered the position. The reference check process would be done during a period between the first and second interviews. He would recommend doing on-site reference checks on the last few candidates by a small group to get a better sense of the candidate. The timelines listed for Phase 3 and 4 were realistic.

Councilor Woodrow asked if it would be advantageous to know their background before they got to the second interview.

Mr. Spiry said background checks and reference checks were more invasive. Some candidates preferred not to have others in their current organization know they were considering another position. In the screening process, questions were developed to get an idea of the candidate's character, communication style and personality. Background checks were done by an expert.

Councilor Fitch wanted to hear Councilor Pishioneri and Councilor Ralston's input.

Mayor Leiken relayed the following from Councilors Pishioneri and Ralston:

- Councilor Pishioneri said he was strongly in favor of a regional or national search, but that did not mean he was not supportive of city staff who were interested in the position. Councilor Pishioneri said Mr. Kelly had lifted this position to a high level position that many could be interested in.
- Councilor Ralston said he wanted a local search only, but would be supportive if council consensus was for a larger search.

Councilor Fitch said she was supportive of a subcommittee to keep the process moving. She said there were great candidates here in the city, but a recruitment process would be good. She said she felt the internal candidates would stand up well under this search. She agreed that an executive search firm was needed for this type of recruitment as they were expert in this process. She discussed the timeline and would prefer posting it for four weeks, rather than five or six weeks. She felt the search firm could assist in determining that timeline. She said if someone was out there considering this position, they may not need six weeks to decide to apply. Springfield does things in partnerships and moves things along.

Mr. Spiry said four weeks could be satisfactory and would be the minimum.

Councilor Fitch said staff had done a good job in bringing forth the job description and other information, which would allow the subcommittee to move forward.

Mr. Spiry gave a brief summary of a possible timeline. He said staff worked on the RFQ and could put it out in the next few days. He said it wouldn't take firms a long time to respond to the RFQ. Staff would anticipate closing the RFQ by May 3, 2005 and with the guidance of the subcommittee, make a decision on the firm by May 25, 2005. During that process, the subcommittee would also be working on a profile for this position to bring back to council. Following selection of a firm, a draft could be ready for the firm to review. Staff could come to council with a recommendation of the subcommittee regarding the profile on June 13, 2005 and post the position that week. A four week posting would put the posting deadline at about July 8. He discussed the screening and interview panel selections. The executive search firm could do much of the work on this part of the process. At the end of that part of the process, the search firm could present a matrix of the chosen number of top candidates for the subcommittee to review. The subcommittee could refine that search to a recommendation of four to eight candidates that would be interviewed. The subcommittee could come back to council in late July or early August to recommend the panel for interviewing. Interviews could then be conducted in September.

Councilor Lundberg agreed with the four week posting, but would defer to the expert firm.

Mayor Leiken said he had contacted all councilors regarding the three person subcommittee. He selected Councilor Ballew, Councilor Lundberg and himself to serve on the subcommittee. He noted that although there was a three person subcommittee assigned to this, Springfield

councilors communicate and get along well with each other and would continue to have dialogue. That may slow things down to a degree. Mayor Leiken noted that Mr. Kelly had been City Manager of Springfield for over sixteen years and had a good reputation statewide. He discussed comparisons he heard when he first became Mayor about past Mayor's and himself. He said it would be beneficial to have the strengths that Mr. Kelly possesses, but they would not be hiring the next Mike Kelly, but rather the next City Manager. Mr. Kelly had lifted the profile of City Manager of Springfield and he should be proud of his guidance over the years. He referred to Mr. Spiry's comment that this may be one of the more important decisions council would make. Mayor Leiken said he felt this would be the single most important decision they would make. The next City Manager would most likely be here after this council was gone. This would be a lasting and important decision for the success to Springfield.

Mr. Spiry said Human Resources Administrative Secretary Jan Jamison would work with the City Manager's staff to schedule the subcommittee meeting. He asked Mr. Leahy if the subcommittee meetings needed to be public meetings.

Mr. Leahy said that was correct if the subcommittee was making a recommendation to the council. He said any information and writings from those meetings would also be public.

Mr. Spiry said there would be some executive sessions and some public meetings. He explained when executive sessions would be called.

Councilor Ballew asked if the general duties and responsibilities for the City Manager were in draft form.

Mr. Spiry said that was correct. One of the first tasks of the subcommittee would be to review the profile and create duties and responsibilities. He referred to material included in the agenda packet which would be helpful. Other study materials would be provided to the subcommittee to help them create this profile. It would be important to find ways to define the job of the City Manager for Springfield.

Mayor Leiken thanked Mr. Spiry for his excellent work on this item.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:58 p.m.

Minutes Recorder – Amy Sowa

---

Sidney W. Leiken  
Mayor

Attest:

---

Amy Sowa

City of Springfield  
Council Work Session Minutes  
April 25, 2005  
Page 12

City Recorder